

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

MARGARET MODUPE OGUNSUYI, a/k/a
Margaret Adewolu,
Petitioner,

v.

No. 00-1054

U.S. IMMIGRATION & NATURALIZATION
SERVICE,
Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals.
(A70-799-304)

Submitted: July 10, 2000

Decided: July 28, 2000

Before MURNAGHAN, WILLIAMS, and MICHAEL,
Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Randall C. Johnson, JOHNSON & ASSOCIATES, Arlington, Virginia, for Petitioner. David W. Ogden, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Richard M. Evans, Assistant Director, Joseph F. Ciolino, Office of Immigration Litigation, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Margaret Ogunsuyi, a native and citizen of Nigeria, petitions for review from the Board of Immigration Appeals' (Board) order affirming the decision of the immigration judge (IJ) denying her applications for suspension of deportation, asylum, and withholding deportation. We deny the petition for review.

Ogunsuyi concedes that she no longer qualifies for suspension of deportation because she had not continuously resided in the United States for seven years at the time deportation proceedings were initiated against her. See Appiah v. INS, 202 F.3d 704 (4th Cir. 2000), petition for cert. filed June 15, 2000 (No. 99-10039).

Addressing Ogunsuyi's applications for asylum and withholding deportation, the Board may summarily dismiss any appeal in which the appellant fails to specify the reason for the appeal on the notice of appeal or on another document filed with the Board. See 8 C.F.R. § 3.1(d)(1-a)(i)(A) (1999); Toquero v. INS, 956 F.2d 193, 195-96 (9th Cir. 1992) (affirming dismissal when notice of appeal did not indicate how the IJ misinterpreted the evidence). Ogunsuyi's appeal to the Board as to asylum and withholding was deficient under 8 C.F.R. § 3.1(d)(1-a)(i)(A) because it failed to specify what law or regulation was misapplied or which facts were not considered. Therefore, the Board's dismissal was proper, and we deny the petition for review.

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED